

1 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
2 MICHAEL A. JACOBS (Bar No. 111664)  
mjacobs@mofo.com  
3 MARC DAVID PETERS (Bar No. 211725)  
mdpeters@mofo.com  
4 DANIEL P. MUINO (Bar No. 209624)  
dmuino@mofo.com  
755 Page Mill Road  
5 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1018  
Telephone: (650) 813-5600 / Facsimile: (650) 494-0792

6  
7 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
DAVID BOIES (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
dboies@bsfllp.com  
8 333 Main Street  
Armonk, NY 10504  
9 Telephone: (914) 749-8200 / Facsimile: (914) 749-8300  
10 STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (Bar No. 144177)  
sholtzman@bsfllp.com  
11 1999 Harrison St., Suite 900  
Oakland, CA 94612  
12 Telephone: (510) 874-1000 / Facsimile: (510) 874-1460

13 ORACLE CORPORATION  
DORIAN DALEY (Bar No. 129049)  
dorian.daley@oracle.com  
14 DEBORAH K. MILLER (Bar No. 95527)  
deborah.miller@oracle.com  
15 MATTHEW M. SARBORARIA (Bar No. 211600)  
matthew.sarboraria@oracle.com  
16 500 Oracle Parkway  
Redwood City, CA 94065  
17 Telephone: (650) 506-5200 / Facsimile: (650) 506-7114

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
19 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE, INC.

Defendant.

Case No. CV 10-03561 WHA

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.'S RESPONSE  
TO DEFENDANT'S ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO SEAL ITS **DAUBERT**  
**PRÉCIS**

Dept.: Courtroom 9, 19th Floor  
Judge: Honorable William H. Alsup

1 Plaintiff Oracle America, Inc. (“Oracle”) opposes Google’s Administrative Motion to Seal its  
2 précis, and requests that the Court deny that motion and file Google’s précis in the public record.

3 Google claims that filing under seal is warranted by summary references to, or  
4 mischaracterizations of, Oracle “attorneys’ eyes only” (“AEO”) material included in the précis.  
5 Google does not limit its proposed redactions to references to materials that Oracle designated AEO.  
6 Instead, Google’s redactions include:

- 7 a. Information that is clearly in the public domain (for example, its general reference to the  
8 overall value of Oracle’s acquisition of Sun);
- 9 b. Google’s erroneous or distorted descriptions of the facts (for example, its incorrect  
10 assessment of the value of one of the patents-in-suit);
- 11 c. Google’s misrepresentation of aspects of Professor Cockburn’s damages analysis (for  
12 example, the misrepresentation that Professor Cockburn included all Google advertising  
13 revenue from all Android devices and all harm from fragmentation of Java in his  
14 valuation calculations, the misrepresentation that he applied a 50% royalty rate as part of  
15 his analysis—a misrepresentation that Google admits in its full *Daubert* motion—and  
16 the misrepresentation of the amount of Professor Cockburn’s ultimate damages  
17 opinion);
- 18 d. Isolated words such as “multi-billion” and “valueless”; and
- 19 e. Any and all references to the fact that Oracle’s damages claims in this case are in the  
20 billions of dollars.

21 As Oracle will explain in its Opposition to Google’s *Daubert* motion, Oracle’s damages claims  
22 are based on both accepted methodology and a wealth of concrete evidence. They should not be hidden  
23 from public view.

24 Consequently, Oracle does not object to making the summary information supposedly—though  
25 inaccurately and misleadingly—extracted from confidential/AEO documents public.

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 By opposing Google's administrative motion to seal, Oracle America does not intend to waive  
2 its ability to claim confidentiality over the documents on which Google's representations and  
3 misrepresentations are based.

4 Dated: June 16, 2011

5 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP

6 By: /s/ Steven C. Holtzman  
7 Steven C. Holtzman

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
9 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA